

REMARKS

The last sentence in paragraph 18 has been deleted.

The Examiner has rejected all of the claims, stating that they are not enabled.

The last sentence of paragraph 18 has been deleted. If the Examiner is confused by the specification, this deletion should remove any source of confusion.

Regarding enablement, the claims are considered part of the specification and are to be considered themselves when determining enablement.

The Applicant believes that a person having ordinary skill in the art would immediately understand and know what to do just by reading the claims themselves.

With any confusion now removed, this rejection is overcome.


The Applicant reiterates the arguments made in the appeal brief with respect to the prior art rejections.

The Applicant believes the case is now ready for allowance or appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW J. PODUSKA

BY:


Gregory G. Williams, Reg. No. 31,681

SIMMONS, PERRINE, ALBRIGHT & ELLWOOD, P.L.C.
Third Floor Tower Place
22 South Linn Street
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Telephone: 319-887-1368
Facsimile: 319-887-1372

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, Fax
No. 571-273-8300 on July 29, 2005.


Marian Palmersheim